AMERICAN

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. I.—AUGUST, 1889.—NO. 8.

PRESENT ASPECT OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.*

(*The Divinity School.*)

Constitutiones Catholicæ Universitatis Americæ a Sancta Sede Approbatæ cum Documentis Annexis. Romæ, ex Typographia Polyglotta S. C. De Propaganda Fide. MDCCCLXXXIX.

Constitutiones Propriæ Sacrarum Scientiarum Scholæ in Magno Americanorum Lycæo.

I.

It is just four year ago since the official announcement was made by His Eminence, the Cardinal Archbishop of Baltimore, that the project of erecting a Catholic national university, inaugurated at the Third Plenary Council, had assumed a definite form and was on the point of being carried into effect. At about the same time the Holy Father had in a

* There will appear in the Review, among other papers on the subject of "the Catholic University of America," a summary history of the Institution from its first beginning, written by the Rev. Dr. P. J. Garrigan, Vice Rector of the University. From the same pen we will also have an accurate description of the Divinity School and its different appointments, together with illustrations of the interior plan, made directly from the designs of Mr. E. Francis Baldwin, the architect of the University, who kindly furnished his drawings for the purpose. (Edit. Am. Eccl. Review.)

private letter to the Apostolic Delegate,[1] expressed his own sentiments on the subject. "It affords us," he says, "great delight to hear that you, in union with the other Bishops, propose to carry at once into effect the project of erecting a Catholic national university. Surely, such an institution, under the auspicious and vigilant care of the united Episcopate, must needs become a great boon to religion as well as to your country; for it will serve in every way to enhance the splendor of the Catholic name, together with the growth of the sciences and arts." At the sessions of the Council, the previous year, the Bishops had expressed their unhesitating conviction that the time for the accomplishment of this great work had arrived.[2] Now that this initiatory step had actually been taken, there remained no longer any room for conjecture as to the opportuneness of the undertaking. The commission appointed for the purpose set about determining the resources upon which they might definitely rely. Within precisely a year[3] they were able to report to the Holy See that as the result of their investigation they could vouch with certainty for the pecuniary resources necessarry to begin the establishment of the university on a sound financial basis. "Experimento enim facto, certiores jam redditi sumus eam corrogari posse pecuniæ vim quæ satis foret ad Seminarium Principale fundandum, sive ad Theologicam Universitatis propositæ Facultatem in perpetuum dotandum." There would be a fund sufficient to endow in perpetuity a theological faculty. This was the beginning, the most important and necessary part of the university. The commission also asked the Holy See for the canonical approbation, and laid down the plan upon which the proposed university was to be erected. As it was to be a true centre of all the higher studies, its halls

[1] This letter bears the date Oct. 22, 1885, and is found in the Acta of the Council under the heading "E Congregationibus Privatis Excerpta" iv., p. lxvi.

[2] Re mature perpensa, convenerunt Patres, jam advenisse tempus, quo grande hoc opus inchoandum sit. (Conc. Pl. Balt. III., n. 183.)

[3] Oct. 25, 1886. (Constitut. p. 14.)

were to be open to all classes of students who could prove their ability to profit by its teaching. Its professors and tutors might be chosen from among the most eminent men of every rank and order, whether secular, religious, or lay, and from any nation. But its government would ever be under the control of the American Episcopate, and no subsequent legislation could alter this provision, which was to insure its character as a universal centre of learning. "Concilii Patribus placuit ut universitas sub omnimoda semper maneret Episcoporum directione et regimine, neque cujuslibet Ordinis Religiosi curæ omnino deputaretur." But the discipline of the higher seminary, as part of the university, would be in the hands of the Fathers of St. Sulpice, whose special vocation fits them for the apt training of ecclesiastics. To emphasize the central character of the university, the national capital of the United States had been chosen for its location. The city of Washington combined singular advantages, not to be found elsewhere to the same degree. Here men from every part of the nation, and of its best society, would constantly gather for the purpose of legislating for the nation, and guarding its interests. The spontaneous intercourse arising out of this meeting could not but tend ultimately to develop the highest intellectual as well as social culture. Amid the concourse of statesmen, selfmade by dint of labor and talent, of learned jurists, of eloquent representatives, who expressed the various conditions and claims of every class of people; amid the store of libraries and multiple appliances collected with a uniform purpose during a century of national growth, the student of law, of ethics, and political economy, the men whose special vocation calls them to influence the temper of and guide the masses, all alike would find here singular opportunities of imbibing and increasing practical knowledge. The democratic character of our government makes it possible for those who possess great powers to become at all times the real leaders of our people. And in this we Catholics are all the more American, because no two institutions bear in their

autonomy so close a resemblance to each other as does the government of this Republic to the goverment of the Church. Besides all these advantages, the temperate climate, the splendid beauty of the city, within one of the fairests tracts of country in the land, where the sunny campus is bounded by the pleasant grove, invite the student—

> "Felicesque vocat pariter studioque locoque
> Mæonidas."

We pointed out on a former occasion [1] that the difficulties which would present themselves to the accomplishment of this great work were manifold and serious, and that they might arouse the just anxiety of all who have at heart its ultimate success, or, what was intimately bound up with it, viz.: the good sound of our Catholic name and cause. To-day these difficulties have in great part yielded, nay, some have deftly been turned into material towards the construction of the work itself. If there are still men who shrug their shoulders in disloyal criticism, they can hardly be just in estimating the value of what has actually been done in an incredibly short time.

The American bishops had deemed it necessary to select for the fulfilment of this task a single man, to whose zeal, judgment, and tact every detail was to be entrusted. Perhaps the work could not have been accomplished otherwise; at least, not in the same brief space of time. It will remain a remarkable fact in the history of the University, and goes far to prove what has sometimes been denied, especially by those who espouse the evolution theory in the science of events, namely, that the destinies of great bodies are best directed by the individual, who, having recognized the common sensus intimus of his time, knows how to give it corresponding expression, knows how to draw into a single channel the varying heated elements, so that they may commingle and flow into the form prepared for them, where, cooling, they are fash-

[1] "American Cath. Quarterly Review," Oct. 1885.

ioned into the bell whose peerless sound will tell in unmistakable signs its time unto coming generations.

The history of what has been done in detail will appear later in these pages. The fact accomplished is the foundation, actual and equipped, of a Divinity School. And with this a most solid foundation of the University has been laid. The difficulties that could hinder this have been overcome. Not indeed, that activity might cease. The day of glorious rest shall in all likelihood be not outlived by our generation. But in ordering the Divinity School a power has been created, which will act for the accomplishment of what remains to be done. The youth who will meet in the lecture halls of the University next November, fulfil, whether they are conscious of the task or not, a larger mission than that of obtaining varied theological knowledge to benefit themselves or those with whom they come in contact.[1] They open a fresh avenue to other men, create new aspirations towards greater things, are founders as well as first students of the University. Whilst it is, therefore, desirable that only the best, the most promising of our divinity students be admitted to matriculate at the University, it is also likely that such will be the case. It was, and not without reason, feared that one of the hindrances to the successful inauguration of the University would be a certain want of enthusiasm for the obtaining of that higher culture, which, always the dowry of the few, would find less appreciation among us, by reason of the prevailing need for missionary work and missionary laborers. An observant foreigner,[2] who has studied the American people at different times, covering a period of 18 years, with more than usual care, and who has accordingly done us more justice than the many Englishmen who have hitherto sat in judgment upon Americans and their affairs, grants that American society offers every prospect

[1] Litteræ Episcoporum ad SS. Dom. Nostrum Leonem XIII, 6. (Const., pag. 17).

[2] The American Commonwealth, by James Bryce, M.P., D.C.L., Regius Professor of Civil Law in the University of Oxford, author of "The Roman Empire." Macmillan & Co., London. 1889.

of soon standing in the front rank of intellectual culture. Speaking of the American universities in the Atlantic States, Mr. Bryce says: "They are resolved to bring their highest education up to the European standard and to keep pace with the progress of science, filled with that love of experiment and spirit of enterprise which are so much stronger in America than anywhere else in the world." This spirit of intellectual enterprise, "much stronger than anywhere else in the world," explains that, if there is a prominent bent toward material progress, which has caused Americans to set a lesser value upon purely intellectual activity, it is simply the result of a necessity which will prove to be shortlived. At all events, the fear of "no demand" has been allayed by the fact that there have been found a good number of students who, understanding the purpose of the University, are anxious to profit by the advantages which it will offer. Nor does there seem to be any likelihood that the high standard of teaching proposed in the Constitutions of the University will have to be lowered to accommodate applicants, as every one knows to be the case with many institutions of learning, which, being simply colleges, claim the name of a university.[1] Among those who have signified their intention to matriculate at the University next November, a good number are young priests, who have just finished a complete course of philosophy and theology in the Diocesan Seminaries. The majority are what might be called the best men of their colleges, recommended by their superiors and likely to prove an honor to the "Alma Mater" which sends them for a post-graduate course or for degrees. Such is the present general aspect of the new University. But we wish to say something of the Divinity School, its aim and likely results as well as its methods in particular, so far as they regard the body of students who propose to enter there.

[1] This, of course, is not to be said of Catholic institutions alone, but is universal and acknowledged by the principal representative men of education among us.

II.

The two leading factors which called the University into being were, first, the necessity of an all-sided and thorough education in the higher branches of science and art, which education would not only be free from the taint of a false philosophy, but would fit those who embraced it to combat the errors which threatened to destroy the life of society, safe alone as long as it rests on sound religious principles. As the clergy were the main representatives of these principles and the actual educators of our people, it was deemed of first importance to supply the opportunities of a superior culture to these. The usual curriculum of our theological seminaries, which, after the completion of a classical course, demands two years of philosophy, and from three to four years of theology, might be sufficient to train the mind to exact reasoning, and to furnish it with the main principles of solving difficulties in metaphysics, ethics, or theology. But it could not pretend to cover the whole ground, or go to that depth in the sciences, which, it was understood, is required in the educated society of to-day. It could not follow up the many schools of thought, with their endless varieties of speculation which, though futile, claimed the attention of the thinking public, and which one could not pretend to answer without thoroughly knowing them. We needed men who would be possessed of this knowledge, and be exercised in the use of it. And to train them we wanted an institution more perfectly equipped for the purpose than any of those which we actually had, or which were accessible to our clergy, who might desire these advantages. Such was the language of the last Plenary Council.[1]

[1] Philosophiæ Theologiæque tanta est amplitudo ac profunditas, ut studiorum curriculum statutum, in seminariis majoribus percurrendum, reconditis harum scientiarum eruendis thesauris minime sufficiat. Permagni tamen interest, ut Ecclesiæ hisce in regionibus militanti nunquam desint viri iisdem disciplinis eruditissimi, qui causam veritatis strenue et invicte tueri valeant contra omnigena errorum monstra et opinionum deliramenta, nostra præsertim ætate. Quamobrem magnopere optan-

That infidelity is making rapid strides in this country, and has the patronage of not a few of the Protestant universities, is becoming daily more apparent, and the Commission appointed to consider the matter of beginning the work of a Catholic university deemed any delay hazardous in the face of the threatening danger. Referring to the Canonical Approbation of the Institution by the H. See, the Commission addresses Cardinal Simeoni, Prefect of the Propaganda: Inter rationes quæ nos movent ad illam gratiam sine mora expostulandam, præcipua est quod doctrinæ in plerisque Protestantium Universitatibus hujus nostræ regionis traditæ magis ac magis ad rationalismum et infidelitatem deflectant, ita ut Catholici juvenes, qui scientiam acquirere exoptant, nec veri nominis Universitatem Catholicam hucusque habuerint, in maximo periculo fidem amittendi versentur.[1] There were, it is true, the European universities, to which students from this country could periodically repair to obtain the salutary waters of a superior knowledge, by which they might quench the smouldering flames of irreligious teaching. But latterly the fire has spread, and is being kindled by the hundred hands of Gigas, so that it has become necessary to have a domestic supply, constant and easily accessible. It is true, there was nothing all the while to prevent the religious orders or any class of ecclesiastics from carrying on these studies to that degree which would be attained in any of the great centres of high intellectual culture.

Still, if it was so done, it would necessarily be exclusive, and could only benefit the few, exercising but little influence on the entire body of our clergy. And this brings us to the second factor, which was an immediate motive in the erection

dum est, ut hisce in Statibus præclarum quoddam scientiæ existeret centrum, in quo juvenes ingenio et virtute prævalentes, consueto studiorum absoluto cursu, disciplinis theologicis, vel juri canonico, aut philosophicis una cum naturalibus scientiis aliisque quæ viros ecclesiasticos nostrates decent, tres quatuorve annos impendere possent.

(Conc. Pl. Balt. III., n. 182.)

[1] Constit., pag. 27.

of the Divinity School, whence the University was to rise in full growth.

A Catholic centre of learning was wanted. Not merely manifold knowledge of a high character at home, not many individual springs of wisdom, rejoicing and fructifying the land, but a fountain on the summit of the mountain, which, sending its limpid waters adown the sunny slope, would gather into a mighty stream all the rivulets which it might meet in its course, making them each contribute to the great movements by which the soil was to be purified, our natural wealth to be enriched, and which would drive many a wheel to aid our industry and carry on its bosom the activity of the nation, fair vessels of every sort, and freighted with all things good. This stream would give an outlet to many a tributary, giving life to its flow and swelling its course. It would determine the current of many a streamlet which would meet it. Thus the University will act upon the river system of our colleges and schools, which become its tributaries. It will give a healthy direction to public opinion so far as Catholic truth and principle, united to a loyal love of country, can influence that opinion. It will insure prosperity to the land, and be a joy to the citizens who live within its range. The importance of this idea of a central source of Catholic thought cannot be overstated. It will receive its illustration, first and foremost, from the influence it exercises upon the entire teaching organism of the American Church. It has been said that our educational system is still in many ways defective, and that nearly all the lower grades of schools need much reforming. To use a common comparison, the ground stories of our educational edifice need finishing, which implies that attention to higher education might be deferred for some time yet, and that the University is a premature step. Now we believe it true that our Catholic schools and colleges are by no means what they could be made to be. But they certainly exist, and no one will deny that, of late years, very much advance has been made, though not in every place alike. The University Com-

mission emphasize this fact when, in their letter to the Holy Father, they say that their attention is being constantly devoted to the allsided improvement of our common Catholic schools, no less than to those of higher grade. We don't paint and finish our houses until the roof is on. The entire educational system is a complete edifice, and each part helps to suggest the proportionate improvement of the rest. Certainly, where there is no elementary education at all, where people cannot read or write, it were absurd to establish a place for higher education. But this is surely not the case with us. The University, once that its existence has become a fact, will necessarily act as a regulator and promoter of all other education in the land. As the schools depend for their efficiency mainly on the clergy, the students of the New Divinity Department are those to whom we must look for the first impulse towards elevation of our normal standard. And it behooves us all to see that they may not disappoint us, by encouraging them to attend to the business for which they have been selected, with becoming zeal, yet with such honorable freedom as will make their labor a hopeful task. Thus, the idea of a central source of Catholic thought is shown in its usefulness as regulating at once, and keeping in healthy activity, the teaching organism of the American Church.

We might say the same of the press. One of the recognized and leading offices of the old universities was that they were to hold high tribunal, where public opinion would be vigorously judged, where strife of rivalry among the learned and influential was settled, where the written word of every man might find its lawful and just censor. Now it must rejoice the heart of every true priest, who reads for more than pastime, to think that there should arise in our midst such a tribunal, whence may proceed a wholesome censorship. Could this body of judges be bribed or degenerate? Not if it be true to the Constitutions and the faith to which it is solemnly pledged. No matter how extensive hereafter the influence of the University in its various faculties may become, its

Divinity School will ever be the first and most sacred guardian of its religious creed and morals. Nor can this powerful stream, strong from the very fact of its lofty descent, be without influence upon every portion of the clergy. Whilst it opens constant opportunities of mental culture, even though it be but to the privileged few, it facilitates on all sides the social intercourse with men of higher acquisitions. It will quite naturally tend to confirm and increase the legitimate influence of the ecclesiastical body on the whole. Sydney Smith could write of us in the beginning of this century: "The Americans, at least in the old states, are a very religious people. Their clergy are respectable, respected, and possess no small share of influence." Now, whether the same may be said of the clerical fraternity as it goes in these days or not, it is quite certain that, in so far as we co-operate with the efforts of the new University, we shall possess that share of public authority which by right belongs to our state, and the exercise of which is more fully allowed us in this land than anywhere else, if we can but assert our claim with sufficient dignity. It is the very nature of the American government that men who have real influence upon any class of people could make that influence felt by the entire mass of the population. If it is the prerogative of truth and integrity to command respect, and to wield a certain power over man, we should certainly be a dominant factor in the maintenance of justice, order, and public morality in general. Our people obey us. They are to be found everywhere, and are recognized as having a right to exercise whatever share of power falls to them by reason of their numbers. Surely, if it be true that in Catholic communities there is frequently no less corruption than among those who profess no religion at all, it can have its cause only in the fact that we do not exercise the powers for good which we undoubtedly have, seeing that our teaching authorizes neither falsehood nor corruption, but tends by every precept to diminish both. And the want of this exercise comes, in turn, too often from the absence of a harmonized attack upon

certain public evils. It is not the number of soldiers which secures a victory, but the steady and uniform discipline, directed and guarded from a central point. Thus many abuses of the freedom of the press will be easily corrected by the establishment of a centre, whither every eye and mind is turned, and whence proceeds that authoritative impulse which is the prerogative of superior knowledge.

III.

The Divinity School is, then, the germ whence that perfect growth of the complete University is to rise, which will feed and delight generations to come with its healthy intellectual fruit and with the widespread and protecting shades of its social influence. The teaching it offers surpasses that of our present Ecclesiastical Seminaries and the higher schools of philosophy both in extent and dignity. The students who matriculate for the purpose of obtaining the honors which it has the right and privilege to bestow are expected to have finished what is called the complete course in philosophy and theology, as taught in the Diocesan Seminaries. The curriculum of the Divinity School will cover a four years' course of Christian Ethics, Theology, Ecclesiastical History, Liturgy, Patrology, Hermeneutics, and Exegesis. The full course of Canon Law is three years. Lectures are also given in the higher branches of mental philosophy and the sciences. The incomparable system of St. Thomas Aquinas will be the guiding text, so adapted as to receive its illustration from the last results in experimental science. No one can, of course, be admitted as a regular student of the University who has not, by previous examination or certificate of qualification from a reputable college or seminary, proved his ability to enter successfully upon these studies. It is evident from the quality of the examination that the average grade of knowledge demanded for entering the university is above that which is exacted at most of the European centres, unless we except Louvain and some of the German Universities.

This is an excellent start, if insisted upon, as it gives to the New Department at once that elevation which is expected from it, and which must be maintained in order to command the respect and admiration essential to its real usefulness. We have already shown how the University would act upon those other institutions of learning which become tributary to it by sending their best students here for a post-graduate course or for degrees. The superior stand which it naturally takes will allow it to form an accurate judgment of the relative value of the teaching given in these institutions, and thus to lead the way to the introduction of uniformity in matter and method, as also correct some acknowledged abuses, arising out of a false sense of rivalry. As the honors given by the University are to be the result of high merit exclusively, their bestowal cannot fail to provoke a wholesome emulation among the various seminaries and colleges represented in its lists at the annual examinations for degrees. In all this there is no likelihood that the University would ever depart from its high standard, since it has been wisely started upon a financial basis which will not make it dependent for success or failure upon the number of students who may support it. Thus we can confidently expect that it will hold its dominant position, on which, in fact, all that we have here expressed as the probable results of its teaching must depend.

Priests and clerics, both secular and religious, have access to the university, provided they comply with the requisite conditions and bear written letters from their ordinary or religious superior. Residence in the University is obligatory unless in cases of special exemption by the superior. Students belonging to religious communities may reside in separate houses, under the supervision of their respective superiors, and attend the lectures at the University. We understand that the Alumni of the Paulist Fathers in New York are to occupy quarters near the University at the opening of its course of lectures in November. It is expected that other religious communities will avail themselves of

similar advantages. The selection of studies and attendance at lectures is not left to the option of the student, but the courses of reading will be defined and changes can be made only after consultation and with the consent of the superiors. Any alumnus, however, who has been entered for a definite course may attend lectures otherwise not obligatory. The privilege of attending lectures is likewise granted to externs, provided they obtain a permit from the Rector. The ordinary language of the lectures, examinations, etc., in the Divinity School is to be the Latin, but there will be also lectures in other languages.

Although the present course provides only for students who have completed the regular seminary curriculum, Leo XIII, in his letter to the Rector of the University wherein he formally approves the Constitutions, points out that it would increase the usefulness of the University, if it also provided for students who had not yet completed their ordinary course of philosophy and theology, but wished to do so at the University itself. The following clause in the Constitution deals with the subject: "Those who by the concession of the H. See (mentioned before), are admitted to the schools of theology at the University, not having previously made any studies in this science, must bring certificates to show that they have studied a regular course of philosophy for at least two years and with success. The students are allowed to pass an examination for the Baccalaureate after their second year in theology. After the third year, they may go up for the Licentiate. But they cannot apply for the Doctor's cap before the end of their fourth year.[1] We believe there will hardly be any students belonging to this category admitted the first year.

Those students who have finished with credit the regular course of theology at any of our seminaries will be admitted to the examinations for the Baccalaureate upon their or-

[1] Constitut. cap. iv., § 6.

trance, and to the Licentiate after their first year at the University, whilst at the end of the second year they may pass for the Doctorate.

The honors of the University are, however, also open to those who, having completed the same studies elsewhere, say at Louvain or Innsbruck, present themselves for examination. But in these cases the academic senate will decide whether the student applying may be admitted to trial or not.

The Doctorate in Canon Law can be obtained only by those who, having exhibited the certificate of qualification for the Baccalaureate, that is, after finishing the ordinary course of theology, have read Canon Law for two full years, passing the examination for the Licentiate after the first year.

The examinations for academic degrees are both oral and written. They are made in public, in presence of the Academic Senate and Faculty. The oral examination of each candidate for the Doctorate may not last less than an hour and a half. The Professors distinguished as Doctores Decuriales and Collegiales alone have the right of suffrage in deciding the result of the examinations. The candidate is, moreover, required to be able to defend a given number of theses, according to the Constitutions at least fifty, covering the entire range of the theological sciences, and he is, besides, expected to write a treatise of solid and superior character.

The collegiate discipline of the Divinity School being under the direction of the Order of St. Sulpice, the president of the college is at the same time ex officio member of the Academic Senate. He makes a monthly report concerning the affairs of his college to this body. Besides the regular professors, there will be, as in the University colleges, preceptors and tutors, who act as assistants to the teaching faculty.

Though each college, as it forms, is likely to select its own patron, to be marked in the Kalendarium of the University, the great tutelary feasts of the University will be those of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin and of the Angelic Doctor, St. Thomas Aquinas, whilst the Divinity

School has for its special feast that of St. Paul, Doctor Gentium, which will be celebrated annually on the 25th of January.

Such are, in the main, the methods by which is to be aroused emulation to the pursuit of that higher knowledge which, above all, the clergy cannot dispense with in these times without sacrificing some of the prestige of their position and the usefulness of their mission. An eminent Protestant divine has expressed this fact with singular force. He takes for granted that there is a decided decline, in our day, of the influence which the clergy possessed in former times and to which they are entitled, and he traces this loss to the absence of a thorough theological training. He insists that a clergyman who would command respect must not only be thoroughly conversant with all the documents on which the faith he preaches is based, he must not merely know its historical credentials, and be familiar with the principal controversies on the subject by which it becomes clear whether what he preaches is matter of faith or of opinion, but he needs to be solidly schooled in those principles of knowledge which will enable him to confute the skeptic. "He that will approach this kind of controversy—and who can now avoid it,—must be skilled in metaphysics: he must have examined the conditions of knowing and being, as the philosophers say; he must meet subtleties with counter-subtleties; and show that even in the handling of such weapons he is no despicable adversary. This is the kind of men who, in the days of Louis XIV. and of queen Anne, raised the Christian pulpit to a position of power and authority, not only among the poor and simple, but among the most cultivated and refined, and even the most wordly and critical thinkers of the day."[1] In another place he says very much to the point: "Next comes the question of culture. This is the point where good can really be done by care and forethought. Hence it is

[1] The Decay of Modern Preaching. By J. P. Mahaffy. New York, McMillan & Co., 1892. pag. 85.

that bishops and colleges and synods should insist that all possible efforts be directed to make the teachers in their churches superior in culture to the average of their congregations. Hence it is that they should insist on University training, or whatever other training in science and literature will lift men out of the herd, and fit them to speak as educated men on the great topics which they profess to expound." [1] Surely, when Protestant divines begin to advocate the general study of metaphysics, it is a sign that there is real and common need of it. The author whom we have cited does not merely blame his Protestant confrères, but he charges the Roman Catholic Church with neglecting this measure of culture in her own clergy. Now we will be far from injuring our cause by admitting at least a measure of the charge, even if it be not put precisely in the form in which one more familiar with the methods of our Catholic theological schools would put it. The more, therefore, may we rejoice that the hopes and desires for a university, which would remedy the evil, are so speedily realized; that the difficulties which to most of us seemed to bar the way to that realization have been overcome by the very swiftness of the impulse with which they were attacked. And the Divinity School, organized and equipped, is the best augury of future success, for it is the corner stone and stronghold of the institution. Whilst as a dispensary of varied learning it will raise our intellectual standard, the wise provision of a well tried discipline, which is to direct its activity and guard its efficiency, is a sure promise that none but truest gentlemen, in feeling as in manners, will inhabit those sacred halls. Knowledge is power, but virtue adds grace to strength and gives it that irresistible charm which has ever conquered the hardest foes of truth. Happy, then, the student who is called thither to be among the first born of that Alma Mater, learning true wisdom from her chaste and eloquent lips and strengthening his high purpose—

[1] Ibid., page 139.

—oft in prayer:
With his mute books around him, while he calls
With such meek invocation as he may
The angels of past ages to supply
The keys of those old written chronicles;
And purchases his knowledge with a vow,
Morning and eve renewed; abjuring fame,
That he will dedicate to holy Church
The scanty produce of his patient toils.

WE PRACTICAL PRIESTS.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS AUCTORE AUGUSTINO LEHMKUHL, S. J. *Volumen I. Continens Theologiam Moralem Generalem et ex Speciali Theologia Morali Tractatus de Virtutibus et Officiis Vitæ Christianæ. Volumen II. Continens Theologiæ Moralis Specialis Partem Secundam seu Tractatus de Subsidiis Vitæ Christianæ. Editio Quinta. Sumptibus Herder*, 1888.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIÆ MORALIS *a Joanne Petro Gury, S. J., Primo Exaratum et deinde ab Antonio Ballerini, ejusdem Societatis Adnotationibus Auctum, nunc vero ad Breviorem Formam Redactum atque ad Usum Seminariorum Hujus Regionis Accommodatum ab* ALOYSIO SABETTI, S. J. *Editio Quarta.—Fr. Pustet et Soc.*, 1889.

MANUALE THEOLOGIÆ MORALIS AUCTORE BENEDICTO MELATA S. T. D.—*Romæ, ex Typographia Tiberina.* 1888.

"Theory," says a well-known ascetical writer, "is not much without practice; yet, without a good theory, practice, for the most part, is not itself worth much, for it is neither fruitful nor enduring." If this be true in most things, it is eminently so in the science and practice of Moral Theology. The latter discipline has, to use the terminology of Father Lehmkuhl, its speculative, its ascetic, and its casuistic side, accordingly as it treats, in the first place, of the virtues and duties of man in the abstract, teaching him their knowledge; next, exhorts

him to their practice, and finally, guides him in the application of that knowledge to the practice in the confessional. In the early ages of Christianity the second element predominated. Moral Theology was not so much a scientific system standing by itself, but a summary of authoritative teaching, scrupulously gathered from the writings of the Fathers, holy and learned men, such as St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. John Chrysostom, St. Gregory the Great, and Bl. Cassian. As for the practice in administering the Sacrament of Penance, it was determined by the canons of various councils, which assigned certain definite penances for definite sins, and later, when public confession went gradually out of use, a penitential code was fixed, which served as a practical guide in the confessional, up to well nigh the thirteenth century, and of which we have still many remnants in the different *libri pœnitentiales*. St. Thomas Aquinas, in applying the reasoning methods of the old philosophers to the practice of theology, gave it a new form. He sounded the origin and traced the progress of the human affections, passions, habits, virtues, and vices; studied their mutual relations and effects, and separated that which is of man, earthly, from that which came to man divinely. All this is treated of in the second part of the Summa. Gradually, the impulse given to speculative theology by St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, and others, who had caught the same spirit, subsided, and men like St. Antoninus, Angelo de Clavasio, and Trovamala, began again to give a more practical turn to the study of Moral Theology, by the compilation of cases of conscience. The Council of Trent called forth a number of eminent theologians, and down to the end of the seventeenth century we have a double line of men, equally successful in evolving on the one side the scientific, on the other, the practical study of Moral Theology. Then began the battle against Probabilism. The Jansenists infected the schools of theology with their unwholesome rigorism, which, however, tended to call forth able opponents. During this era we have such men

as Lacroix, Reiffenstuel, Reuter, Roncaglia, Sporer, Voit, and others. Midway in the following century came at length the deliverer, St. Alphonsus, who, uniting to the solidity of his learning an extreme prudence in judgment and great holiness of life, threw a fresh light upon the study of Moral Theology and dispelled the storm-clouds of strife and doubt. His "Theologia Moralis" and the "Homo Apostolicus" have, since then, become the principal norm for writers on Moral Theology.

We have given this brief survey of the development of the study to show how different times and circumstances call for a change in the treatment of this most essential discipline. Since the time of St. Alphonsus many questions have been added to the range of practical theology. New problems, the result of social revolution, of scientific discovery, of mental and we might also say physical aberration, call for the application of old principles in a thousand new and distracting ways. The task of the confessor, of the disciplinarian of the soul, daily grows with a larger and more trying responsibility. And to be a faithful minister of his charge, to be just to his flock and to himself, he must needs constantly refresh his memory with the principles and precedents of his profession, quite independent of the integrity and virtue befitting his sacred calling, and which tends likewise to keep the mind clear and the judgment unbiassed by the misleading affections of the heart. We have heard of a Protestant lawyer, learned and of long experience in the practice of his profession, who every year with scrupulous fidelity resumes the study of the Jesuit Tongiorgi's Logic from cover to cover, that so he may keep his judgment intact from the influence of prejudices to which every man in contact with the world is more or less liable. The Rt. Rev. Dr. Moriarty, late Bishop of Kerry, in his admirable allocutions to the clergy, reminds us that as priests we are not the sovereign fount of justice or mercy: that we are dispensers only, whose sentence, in order to be valid, must be according to law; for it will otherwise be

surely reversed at the supreme court on the last day, to our confusion and condemnation. "Moral Theology," he says, "contains the law which we administer, according to which we give judgment. Hence the necessity, before we sit in our tribunal, of mastering this sacred science in its principles and its details.—If you refuse the custody of this sacred treasure, the Lord forbids you the exercise of His ministry. *Quia tu scientiam repulisti, ego repellam te, ne sacerdotio fungaris mihi* (Osee iv. 6). We once learned this science in our schools; we satisfied those who were the first judges of our fitness. Have we retained the knowledge that we then possessed? We well knew that this knowledge is a habit of mind, as easily lost as it is laboriously acquired; we know that our memories do not grow more rententive as we advance in years, and hence we should fear lest the rust should have been silently consuming our treasures, *if we have not by continual study* taken the means to guard it. We should fear lest we may be as the blind leading the blind, and doomed to fall into the same precipice.—Venerable brethren, who could count or measure the multitude of sins, unseen and unheeded, which an ignorant administration of the Sacrament of Penance implies? Who could count or measure the multitude of sins which the ignorant minister causes others to commit?--interpreting falsely the law of God, tying on the backs of some burdens which God never intended them to bear—strewing pillows under the heads of others by allowing them to rest in false security in the midst of danger—binding when God would loose, and loosing when God would bind. Even where there is not ignorance, without study, there must be inadvertence. We never turn over a chapter of our theology, but it reminds us of something that was escaping our memory, or to which we were paying less attention"[1] Every one will be able to confirm this last sentence by his own experience.

[1] Allocutions to the Clergy and Pastorals of the late Rt. Rev. Dr. Moriarty.—Dublin: Browne and Nolan. 1884. pag. 29.

It is, indeed, necessary that even the first principles, the general doctrine of moral theologians, be kept constantly before the mind. First of all, because here practice does not, as in other arts, tend to confirm the principles and impress them upon the memory. On the contrary, the frequent hearing of confession is apt to weaken our sense of the enormity of certain sins. Familiarity with crime begets a certain dulness, by which we gradually come to look upon them with indifference or even indulgence. Moreover, there is in ourselves, as men, a natural tendency either to minimize the faults of others, if we are kind of disposition, or else to exaggerate them, if we are naturally selfish, hard, or intolerant. Yet it is extremely difficult to remain objective, as the moralists say, in the tribunal of the confessional, where we are to be at once judges, physicians, and fathers. And even outside of the Sacrament of Penance, in the administration both of the spiritual and temporal affairs of a parish, faults will creep into the judgment, forgetfulness will interfere with the perfect fulfilment of prescribed duties, and defects of manner will show in the observance of Rubrics and ceremonies. *Habitual* study of Moral Theology is the only remedy against these evils. But all priests do not find alike time to devote to this study. Accordingly, we recommend three books, thoroughly reliable each, but suitable to different classes of priests, according as they are more or less constantly occupied in the duties of the practical ministry.

The first of these, Father Lehmkuhl's work in two volumes,[1] is a perfect treatise of Moral Theology, equally serviceable to the professional student and to the practical confessor. In method thoroughly scientific he states and establishes by reason or fact the principles upon which rests the art of arts, drawing his definitions, in the main, from the Angelic Doctor St. Thomas, from St. Alphonsus, and other masters of the sacred science, whose works he frequently places at the

[1] There is also a "Compendium Theologiæ Moralis" by the same author, the latest edition (second) of which appeared in 1887.

head of a chapter, as if to refer to them as his fountains. The application of every principle is the result of logical deduction. A faultless theory is the norm of the practice he teaches. And where there is a legitimate latitude of opinion, where there is need of exceptional application or of warning against misinterpretation, there he adds, after the subject has been, so to say, completed in its strictly scientific outlines, further explanation (uberior explicatio), which throws light upon individual questions, without interrupting or confusing the principal argument. Its completeness leaves nothing to desire. The priest intellectually inclined, whose position allows him sufficient leisure to sustain a correct practice by the intimate knowledge of the "why," will find this work not merely a safe guide to direct him in the solution of difficult cases pertaining to the care of souls, but a stimulus to the sublimer science of the soul itself, which distinguishes the theologian from the well-informed and practical priest. There are, of course, works of more extensive erudition than Father Lehmkuhls' book, but few, if any, that better utilize so much exact erudition, whether drawn from canon law or from what he calls pastoral theology, to illustrate the doctrine of the cura animarum.

Father Sabetti's work serves a different and, for the American clergy, on the whole more directly practical purpose. The number of priests amongst us who have the time and opportunity to pursue the study of theology systematically and as a science is comparatively small. The curriculum of our seminaries, considering the number of other branches of study which have to be compressed into the space of three or four years, hardly permits going over a work such as the above-mentioned theology of Lehmkuhl, which would do well for post-graduate reading. Experience has shown that Gury, which for many years was the received text in our theological schools, and to which the excellent notes of the learned Ballerini had become an essential addition, was altogether too bulky. There were many things in it, especially in the notes,

which, whilst greatly adding to the intrinsic worth of the work, made it a hindrance to the practical student, who had to search among much which was good to find that which was good for him. Many things, too, which suited the Church in Europe, found no application here in America, and the peculiar conditions of society arising out of an anomalous national formation required in many instances new legislation, not provided for by the old code of moral theology. The late Archbishop Kenrick, feeling keenly this necessity, wrote a new Moral Theology, especially suited to the conditions of this country. It passed through several editions, and filled a great want for the time being. Later on the lamented Father Konings did great service to our students, by bringing out his "Compendium Theologiæ Moralis Sancti Alphonsi," which, whilst it reproduced in large part the text of Gury-Ballerini, added whatever was deemed necessary by way of explaining our special ecclesiastical legislation. The work passed through a number of editions during the lifetime of its learned author, and also after his death. When Father Sabetti published his new Compendium, it was at once clear that he had gauged the exact measure of our needs. He had for many years taught the text of Gury-Ballerini at the Jesuit Theological Seminary of Woodstock. Himself a pupil and former companion of the great moralist, he was fully possessed of his master's principles and methods, and his experience in teaching taught him all the more keenly what wanted remedying in the old text-book, in order to make it acceptable and useful to men of our condition. Accordingly he set to work, selecting the best out of the good, combining notes with the text, modifying, fusing, in short, making a new edifice out of the old material. So well did he economize his space, that no important portion is lost to practical use. Instead of the provisions which Gury had made for the Church, principally of France, Sabetti places such as are of importance to the American student. Thus he treats of the school question, of the laws of contract as regulated by our statutes, and, in

general, of Justice and Right from a point of view suggested by the actual condition of our people. It is needless to say to how large an extent this affects the entire work.

Beyond this we owe much to the author for the clear, well-defined way in which he treats the subject of probabilism, showing where the *pars tutior præ non tuta* is to be chosen, a subject about which there seems to have always been more or less of haziness in the mind of students. The faculties granted to our bishops are explained, yet with that prudent reserve which marks safety, and which is a more remarkable trait in Father Sabetti than in Lehmkuhl, though we must confess that sometimes it gives a decided sense of satisfaction to find a theologian venture an opinion on an open question. It goes without saying that the Councils of Baltimore and here and there special synodal decrees have been used throughout, thus giving the work an essentially American character. The work throughout is a model of accuracy.[1] At the end is an exhaustive analytical index, which, being arranged alphabetically, is a decided help in cases of reference. For the great body of our missionary priests no better manual of Moral Theology could be desired. It is short, practical, and safe. The same reasons would recommend it to our students in the seminaries as a text which could be mastered within the usual time of from three to four years, securing completeness of knowledge on the subject as well as uniformity in treating the many new questions of our practical ministry.

We have to say something of the third work placed at the head of this article. Among our priests there are many whose labors give them but little rest at home and less leisure for study. They must travel over large districts, or attend numerous missions. Fortunately, they have on the whole less need of the study of casuistic theology than the priests who dwell in our large centres, which have not unaptly been styled the tumors of human society. The missionary priest cannot

[1] On page 645, second line from below, we notice a superfluous *non*, rendering the sentence somewhat ambiguous.

afford to lose sight of the principles of moral theology and the positive precepts of ecclesiastical law, and he will find it less difficult to make the application in most cases if he refresh his mind frequently with this knowledge. Such a purpose serves the Manual of Moral Theology by Dr. Melata. It can be put in the side pocket and read *inter ambulandum, inter equitandum.* But it serves another purpose, which was, indeed, the one the author had mainly in view. At the approach of the examinations in theology, whether for holy Orders or otherwise, the student would have the text book of his class as it were summarized. It greatly helps a mental review if the eye has not to travel over much ground or turn many pages. The examiners, too, find it considerably easier to do their work with the aid of a manual like this, from which supplementary questions easily suggest themselves, than with a heavy tome before them. Dr. Melata has followed the best authorities on his subject, of which he gives a list, among others Lehmkuhl and Sabetti, which at once testifies to the fact that the book is not only up to date, but takes cognizance of our American conditions, which have shaped the manner in which the author enunciates some of his principles. The little book fully deserves the high encomiums which it has everywhere received for its brevity, solidity, and completeness.

Whatever may be the meaning of "aliter in theoria, aliter in praxi," which is sometimes quoted in defense of doubtful usage, it is not safe to make the theory arise out of the practice. "Quidquid ministri ecclesiæ agunt, secundum ecclesiam agant." (Nitsch, ad theologiam practicam felicius excolendam observationes. Bonnæ, 1831.)

CONFERENCE.

FACULTAS LARGIENDI TER IN ANNO INDULGENTIAM PLENARIAM.

Qu. Among our faculties (Facultates Ordinariæ, Form I., 14.) we have one "largiendi ter in anno Indulgentiam Plenariam contritis confessis ac sacra communione refectis." How is this to be understood? Does it authorize us to give a Plenary Indulgence to three different persons at any time during the year, or to any number of persons three times a year? And is the Indulgence applicable "Pro Defunctis"?

Resp. The faculty gives the right of granting a Plenary Indulgence on *three days* of the year to any number of the faithful, if they comply with the requisite conditions. The Indulgence must, of course, be promulgated, although the manner in which this is to be done is not prescribed. It would seem, from the tenor of the privilege, that, in general, it is intended for those who exercise the cura pastoralis, and for the benefit of the people under their special charge. The Indulgence is not applicable "Pro Defunctis." For the rest, it is supposed to be granted "in forma ecclesiæ consueta," that is, besides the contrite confession and Holy Communion, it requires prayer "ad intentionem S. Pontificis." The Ordinary of the Diocese may appoint the days on which these Indulgences are to be gained in the same manner as the Forty Hours' Devotion. We give verbatim the explanation of this Faculty by the late P. Konings in his "Commentarium in Facultates Apostolicas quæ Episcopis nostris concedi solent."

Ad hujus facultatis significationem pertinet sequens responsum S. C. de Prop. Fide A. D. 31 Jan. 1796, ad Vic. Ap. Sutchuensem quærentem, "Utrum concessio Indulgentiæ ter in anno," de qua in facultate, intelligi debeat distributive per annum fidelibus singulatim ad opportunitatem impertienda:

an tribus per annum præscriptis diebus communiter elargienda ad normam consuetæ praxis in ecclesia?" Responsum fuit: "*Negative* ad primam partem, *affirmative* ad secundam." Poterit tamen Episcopus indulgentiam istam ita largiri, ut, quemadmodum etiam Indulgentiæ XL horarum, diversis temporibus in diversis civitatibus et locis lucrari possit, dummodo in eadem civitate et loco non pluries quam ter publicetur. (S. C. Off. 16 Jan. 1728 ex Responso dato a Secretario S. C. de Prop. Fide 26 Jan. 1877 ad Rssmum Elder, tunc Episc. Natchatens.) Poterit præterea Episcopus unaquaque vice determinare plures dies, intra quarum spatium fideles istam indulgentiam lucrari possint. Ad lucrandas tamen has indulgentias, præter conditiones in facultate præscriptas, requiritur etiam visitatio ecclesiæ ab episcopo designatæ, vel, si episcopo placuerit, diversas ad hunc effectum designare ecclesias, unius ex designatis (Op. citat. pag. 51, n. 70).

Whilst this Indulgence, thus publicly announced, implies the visiting of the respective church as a condition, we believe that a priest enjoying said faculty could impart the Indulgence to a sick person privately, simply requiring the condition expressed in the concession.

BENEDICTION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT DURING XL HOURS' EXPOSITION.

Qu. Is it permitted to interrupt the Forty Hours' Devotion in order to give Benediction at the usual time of Vespers on Sunday afternoon, or at any other time, for the people who cannot come in the evenings?

Resp. Benediction with the most Blessed Sacrament cannot ordinarily be given during forty-hours' prayer. Where, however, as with us, the devotion is not continued uninterruptedly during the night, Benediction is to be given each evening before reposing the Blessed Sacrament in the tabernacle.

This is done in the usual manner, as will appear from the following decrees of the S. Congregation.

DUBIUM.

In expositione in forma Quadraginta Horarum an permittatur singulis diebus sero antequam Sanctissimum Sacramentum reponatur, benedictionem populo cum eodem impertiri?

Affirmative, S. R. C., Die 12, Januarii, 1878.

(Decr. auth. 5716, x.)

DUBIUM.

An antequam SS. Eucharistæ Sacramentum quod occasione Orationis Quadraginta Horarum, vel alia quacumque ex causa, publicæ adorationi expositum fuit, in Tabernaculo reponatur, debeat sacerdos canere hymnum *Tantum Ergo* usque ad finem cum versiculis et Oratione *Deus qui nobis*, ac deinde, servatis juxta Rituale Romanum servandis, cum ostensorio signum crucis super populum facere?

Sacra porro Rituum Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti secretarii, auditoque Rmo. assessore ipsius S. Congreg. sic respondendum censuit: *Affirmative*, et dentur decreta in Ultrajecten., diei 11 Julii 1857, in una ordinis Capucc. Prov. Helv. diei 23 Maji 1835, et in Camerin. diei 26 Martii, 1859. Atque ita respondit atque rescripsit. Die 15 Aprilis, 1880.

(Decr. auth. 5807.)

DUBIUM.

An liceat pluries in eadem ecclesia et die impertiri benedictionem cum SS. Sacramento occasione piarum Congregationum vel ad devotionem; item an liceat interrumpere expositionem SS. Sacramenti pro danda benedictione ob causas indicatas?

Ad primam et secundam partem: juxta prudens Ordinarii arbitrium, evitata tamen nimia frequentia, et *dummodo non agatur de expositione Quadraginta Horarum.* S. R. C. die 11 Maji, 1878.

(Decr. auth. 1728, v.)

LOCATION OF THE SACRISTY.

In the June number of the Review (pag. 230) we answered the question: "Is there any rule by which the Sacristy is to be built on one side rather than the other of the altar?" by saying that, as the celebrant of Mass is to approach the altar from the Epistle side, it appears that the Sacristy should rather be on that side. A Reverend correspondent takes exception to this and desires us to correct what he emphatically styles an error.

Since he believes the matter to be of importance, "especially for America," and adduces arguments which, though erroneous partly in fact, partly in application to the matter in question, have a certain air of correctness, we deem it proper to answer them. The arguments given by our correspondent are:—

That the Celebrant of Mass is to approach the altar from the *Gospel* side is proved first, "ex praxi universali" in Italy, France, Switzerland, etc. Secondly, from the symbolical character of the act, the priest, being *alter Christus ac lumen*, comes from the Gospel [side.] Hence the candles also of the altar are lit from the right to the left. Thirdly, Archæologists concur in this, that the sacristy may be under the tower or under the altar, behind or at the sides of the altar, but where the location permits the sacristy is to be located at the North side of the church, *ergo*, on the right or Gospel side of the altar. "In secretariis vero duobus quæ circa aspidem esse dixi, hi versus indicant officia singulorum. A dextris ejusdem: Hic locus est veneranda penus qua conditur et qua promitur alma sacri pompa ministerii.—A sinistra ejusdem: Si quem sancta tenet meditandi in lege voluntas, hic poterit residens sacris intendere libris." S. Paulin., c. i, p. 338; or Jacob, die Kunst im Dienste der Kirche, or any book of Christian archæology.

We answer. As to the appeal to the "praxis universalis" in Italy, France, Switzerland, etc., we are unfortunately not

in position to verify it, but even if it were so, it would only prove that the "praxis universalis" of those countries is against the Rubrics and against special decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. Where the sacristy is so placed behind the sanctuary that it has two entrances, one by the Gospel and the other by the Epistle side, the celebrant is to approach the altar from the Epistle side and leave by the Gospel side. "Si Sacristia sit retro altare et egressus ex parte epistolæ et evangelii: *per cornu epistolæ est egrediendum ex sacristia et per cornu evangelii regrediendum.*" S. R. C. 12 Aug, 1854, n. 5208, 17; Cf. De Herdt, i. n. 199; Wapelhorst, 84, not. 4. Throughout the ceremonies the motion of the celebrant, whenever he approaches the altar, is from the Epistle side, unless special reasons prevent it. Thus, after the asperges "ab altari discedit ad planum *juxta cornu epistolæ aut ad sacristiam*, ubi pluviale exuit." De Herdt, iii. 133. Even in giving the *asperges* he starts from the Epistle side and ends at the Gospel side, which indicates the same fundamental law.

The symbolical character of the act is by no means interfered with, quite the contrary, by supposing that the priest, *alter Christus ac lumen*, follows the light of the Gospel and returns filled with it. Nor is it true that "hence the candles are lit from the right to the left." The Gospel side is the *pars dignior* of the altar, and the lighting begins there, nearest to the Tabernacle, and proceeds away from it, the same being done on the Epistle side. It might be well to recall in this connection the Rubric (not now in universal use) of the candle to be lighted from the elevation to holy Communion, which "imponitur candelabro infra gradus altaris *a parte epistolæ.*"

About the archæologists there would be a good deal to say if it were necessary to argue the point. Though the position of the church edifice is determined by ecclesiastical canons from very early times, so that, where possible, the altar should look towards the East, there is no canon prescribing the loca-

tion of the sacristy. In the early basilicas the sacristy was generally a chapel in the interior of the church. Later we find it as an adjunct, differently located according to the style of architecture. St. Charles Borromeo, in his Instructions on Ecclesiastical Buildings, speaking of the site of the sacristy, says: "The aspect of every sacristy should as much as possible be towards the East and towards the South. (St. Charles Borr. Instruct. on Eccl. Building, annot. by G. J. Wigley, p. 113. Sacristies.) Jacob, it is true, says that most of the Romanic churches were built with the sacristy towards the North, but that proves simply that it was a favorite style of architecture. For the rest, church builders used their liberty. Catalani in his learned commentary says, "Extruebantur hæc Secretaria, et inferiori parte navis ecclesiæ *ad austrum*, et in superiori circa apsidam. Referring to the passage of St. Paulinus, quoted by our correspondent, he reminds us that the same St. Paulinus shortly before speaks of these sacristies as conchulæ, and that the basilica of Nola, to which they belonged, did not, as was customary, look towards the East. "Prospectus vero Basilicæ non, ut usitatior mos est, orientem spectat." (Catalani, Cæremoniale Episc. Comment., Lib. ii., c. viii., 3.) Moreover, we do not think that the translation of the verses referred to allows any further inference than this, that the sacred vestments and vessels were kept here; since, it being apparently a chapel *within* the basilica, the Bishop said Mass there, taking his vestments, as is still the custom, from the altar. "Tamen cum duabus dextera lævaque conchulis intra spatiosum sui ambitum apsis sinuata laxetur, uni earum immolanti hostias jubilationis Antistiti patet, altera post sacerdotem capaci sinu receptat orantes." (Catal. loc. cit.)

ANALECTA.

LIBRI PROHIBITI.

Decretum S. Officii.

FERIA VI DIE JUNII, 1889.

SACRA Congregatio Eminentissimorum ac Reverendissimorum Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ Cardinalium a *Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leone Papa XIII*, Sanctaque Sede Apostolica Indici librorum pravæ doctrinæ, eorumdemque proscriptioni, expurgationi ac permissioni in universa Christiana Republica præpositorum et delegatorum, mandavit et mandat in Indicem librorum prohibitorum referri quæ sequuntur Opera damnata atque proscripta a Sacr. Congr. S. Universalis Inquisitionis:

Synopsis Juris Canonici prout olim erant et prout nunc sunt tempora per *Hieremiam Fiore*, Canonicum Ecclesiæ Majoris et Matricis sub titulo SS. Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, in oppido Cusani Mutri Diœceseos Telesinæ. Neapoli, ex Typographia Perrottiana, MDCCCLXXXVI.—Decr. S. Off. Fer. iv. die 1 Maji, 1889.

Il Rosmini—Enciclopedia di Scienze e Lettere redatta da un Consiglio di Direzione composto di Scrittori accreditati nei diversi rami del Sapere Milano.—Dec. S. Off. Fer. IV. die 29 Maji.

Itaque nemo cujuscumque gradus et conditionis prædicta opera damnata atque proscripta, quocumque loco, et quocumque idiomate, aut in posterum edere, aut edita legere vel retinere audeat, sed locorum Ordinariis, aut hæreticæ pravitatis Inquisitoribus illud tradere teneatur sub pœnis in Indice librorum vetitorum indictis.

Quibus Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leoni Papæ XIII, per

me infrascriptum S. I. C. a secretis relatis, Sanctitas Sua Decretum probavit, et promulgari præcepit. In quorum fidem, etc.

Datum Romæ, die 14 Junii, 1889.

CAMILLUS Card. MAZELLA, *Præf.*

FR. HYACINTHUS FRATRI, *Ord. Præd.*

S. Ind. Congreg., a *Secretis.*

Loco ✠ Sigilli.

Die 17 Junii, 1889, ego infrascriptus Mag. Cursorum testor supradictum Decretum affixum et publicatum fuisse in Urbe.

VINCENTIUS BENAGLIA, *Mag. Curs.*

BOOK REVIEW.

LA SAINTE BIBLE, texte de la Vulgate, traduction française en regard, avec Commentaires. Introduction au Pentateuque. La Genèse. Par M l'Abbé H. J. Crelier. 1889. Paris. P. Lethielleux. (Pustet & Co.) pp. xxxv. 464.

The Pentateuch is the basis of revealed religion; without it the Bible would be as unintelligible as would be the Epistles without the Gospels. No wonder is it, therefore, that infidelity, which aims at overturning the entire supernatural fabric, should direct its strongest efforts against the authenticity and veracity of this fundamental document. The blows that were struck by the early pagan and Nazaræan, by the medieval rabbi, and even in modern times by Peyrère, Spinoza, Hobbes, etc., told but feebly. Vigorous, though, and directed with all the force and skill that the best trained naturalism can bring to bear against the higher order, have been those dealt by the so called "critical" forces, especially of Germany, during the past century. Equal, however, in tactic and resource, though by no means in number, have been the champions of faith and of the three thousand years of tradition on which rests the authenticity of the sacred record. The ablest defenders are those that have come to the front but yesterday, and are hard at work to-day: Vigoroux, Lamy, Cornély, and the author of the volume before us—the Abbé Crelier. The Introduction to the

Pentateuch is exceeding brief for so large a subject, but we suppose the details of critical points are worked out in the General Introduction, the two volumes of which head this series of Commentaries, and in the volumes on the other parts of the Pentateuch. As it is, however, the author has managed to condense in small compass a great deal on the history of the "higher criticism," the intrinsic and extrinsic arguments for the authenticity and veracity of the Pentateuch, its chronology, and literature. Moreover, ampler treatment of subjects bearing on Genesis is given in the copious commentary on that book, whilst references to more extended works tell where the student may be fully satiated as to matters bearing on the Pentateuch as such.

The Introduction to Genesis deals with the Mosaic cosmogony as a whole, and proves that as to matter and form, in its entirety and detail, the narrative of the creative acts is the expression of reality, distinguished from all other cosmogonies as is truth from fable, and is not only in harmony with the conclusions of philosophy and the certain discoveries of the experimental sciences, but is regarded by genuine scientists as a "preservative against the illusions and errors to which human reason is exposed." (pp. 1–3) These conclusions are developed in detail and illustrated by comparison between the revealed doctrine and the deductions of science, in the elaborate notes on the first chapter. The reader will naturally look for the Abbé Crelier's judgment on the question that has recently so vexed the minds and pens of some biologists and theologians regarding the origin of Adam's body. The author does not refer to the dispute, but there can be no doubt that he follows the literal and traditionary teaching opposed to the evolutionary theory.

Especially excellent are the notes on the genealogies, embodying as they do the best results of comparative ethnology. But whilst throughout the commentary there is manifest that genuine erudition which inspires the student with confidence in the authority of the writer, the profound reflections of the Fathers and their imitators on the sublime truths of the primitive revelation are everywhere interwoven, making the work truly a commentarium pro mente et corde—an aid to study, to teaching, to prayer.

DEPENDENCE: or the Insecurity of the Anglican Position, By the Rev. Luke Rivington, M. A. 1889. London, Kegan Paul & Co. Pp. xii., 243. (Received from Cath. Publ. Soc.)

It was but natural to expect that Mr. Rivington's recent work on

"Authority," wherein in reply to Mr. Gore's late edition of "Roman Catholic Claims" he had stated "a plain reason for joining the Church of Rome" would meet with no welcome reception from his former brethren of the Anglican Church. So telling an argument for the Catholic cause from one who had stood so high in the opposing ranks could not fail to elicit searching criticism. Nor could it be hoped that the rejoinders would always be fair and truth-seeking. On the contrary, the most weighty reply—the "Roman Question"—shows not only an animus unworthy of an aged priest,—"one of the most influential clergymen of the Church of England," but even positive dishonesty. Mr. Rivington had been led to study more closely the arguments for the Catholic Church by a false, or at best doubtful rendering, in the Oxford translation, of a passage in St. Chrysostom, referring to the presidency in the Council of Jerusalem. He states the incident in his work on "Authority" that started his investigation and gives at length (14 pages) the teaching of St. Chrysostom on the subject. The author of the "Roman Question" deliberately accuses Mr. Rivington of "resting his case on a *single sentence*, not regarding the context" (p. 10.), notwithstanding the fact that "in private correspondence he had pointed out to the writer" that not the "single disputed passage," but the lengthy *argument* of the Saint had been the convincing motive! This unfair treatment, however, has been the occasion of varied good—not least of which is Mr. Rivington's present book on "Dependence," wherein the reader may at once follow the workings of an earnest, cultured mind groping after truth, and a detailed exposé of the historical supports of Anglican claims.

"There are few subjects to which an English High-Churchman turns more readily than to the Council of Jerusalem" (p. 7), for therein he thinks he finds a clear instance of nonprimacy. By the misrendering of the passage from St. Chrysostom, above alluded to, St. James is made to preside over this first General Council. Mr. Rivington's first chapter ably shows that the oft repeated teaching of St. Chrysostom is quite the opposite, that the presidency was undoubtedly held by St. Peter, to whom had been 'entrusted the care of the brethren'—who was the 'first of the Apostles and entrusted with the presidency over the œcumenical Church, nay—entrusted with the whole world' (p. 17). The Council of Chalcedon is another corner stone of Anglicanism, "for the Fathers of that Council (630 Bishops) did not feel that any superiority of government belonged to the Roman See on the ground that St. Leo sat in Peter's chair" (p. 36).

Moreover, did not Peter, in the 4th century, fail in the person of Leiberius? The author of the "Roman Question" says "that the Bishop of Rome simply and altogether failed at a 'great crisis'" (p. 65). Again, did not the "Bishops of the Sixth General Council, in condemning Pope Honorius, show that they had not even a 'rudimentary idea of the papal infallibility?'" (p. 77.) Moreover, "can you believe the successors of St. Peter to be infallible in their teaching office, when there is a Rodrigo Borgia amongst them?" (p. 88.) The so called Reformation in England, was it not of "clerical origin?" The clergy of England are said to have desired and made a "change, not of doctrine, but of rule," the Church of England "to have severed herself from Rome and reformed herself." (p. 114.)—To each of these subjects the author devotes a chapter or more, marshalling his arguments with rare skill and dignity, and sending them direct into the lurking places of his opponents. To the "Decline of Dogma" a chapter is given, contrasting the more than vacillation within the Establishment regarding so fundamental a doctrine as that of eternal punishment with the unvarying dogma of the Catholic Church, and manifesting that Mr. Rivington has, indeed, contrary to accusation, thoroughly studied the "question in connection with the history of the communion which he has joined" (p. 161).

Highly interesting and instructive is the chapter on "Pusey and Land." If Dr. Pusey, who was so identified with the Established Church that Cardinal Newman could write to him—after between forty and fifty years of unremitting labor in its service, your roots and your branches stretch through every portion of its large territory (p. 182)—"if Dr. Pusey remained where he was, why cannot you remain in the Church in 'which God has placed you?' (ib.) This is an *argumentum ad personam* which almost every Anglican clergyman making his submission to the Holy See is obliged to answer. The wonderful fascination exercised by the great Oxford divine Mr. Rivington traces to his piety—the intensity of his spirituality—the interest he took in the souls of those who came under his influence; to his chivalry—his noble, unselfish spirit under abuse and vituperation; to his prodigious industry. It is touching to read how the spell which Dr. Pusey had cast upon Mr. Rivington was broken—how gradually the Doctor's "mistakes as to facts" bearing on Catholic subjects became more and more apparent, until the reality could not be ignored that "when Dr. Pusey kept to positive teaching in harmony with the Catholic Church, his immense industry served him well. He could even

then occasionally fall into error, as in his unbalanced statements on post-baptismal sin, which he in a measure retracted in his sermon on absolution. But he could not be accused of inaccuracy, downright mistakes, in that part of his teaching. His book on Daniel is a marvel of exegetical and controversial power. . . . . But directly we turn to his controversial writings against Rome, his hand seems to lose its cunning. His life, too, lost its aroma to many of us. Whilst defending Catholic truth he was the 'despised of men;' he was asailed by every kind of calumny; he had, in a word, the surest sign of acceptance in an outward correspondence to his Master—the world hated him and vented its hate in the most ludicrous lies. But when he began to attack Rome, the world applauded. Everything was changed; His learning betrayed him; his logic forsook him; his persistent industry took the form of what I can only call a determined adherence to his own opinion. Probably no book has appeared in the present century bearing the marks of such prodigious energy with such a list of misinterpretations and even misquotations as Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*. The misquotations are not on minor points, nor some of them such that there can be no two sides to the question. And they were pointed out to Dr. Pusey. They were publicly exposed, so far as they could be (for English Churchmen are probably the only body of men in this country who do not read both sides of the question that most affects them) and Dr. Pusey advertised a reply. He wrote to the author of the work in which his inaccuracies were exposed one sentenc: 'Have patience with me, and I will pay the all.' But years elapsed, and no answer came. Other controversial books against Rome appeared, but the one book which alone could clear Dr. Pusey's reputation never saw the light" (189–190).

Mr. Rivington closes his work with a timely and thoughtful chapter on the "Lincoln Prosecution."

No thoughtful man can read this book without being captivated by its sincerity and calm dignity, nor without feeling the hope that it may fall into the hands of many who are now wandering in the mists of Anglicanism, that they may see the utter delusiveness of their historical claims, and that from its luminous pages light may enter their minds to show them the path into the One True Church, wherein alone there can be abiding peace.

GRAMMAIRE HEBRAIQUE ELEMENTAIRE, par Alphonse Chabot, Curé de Pithiviers. 3me Edit. revue et corrigée. 1889, Herder, Fribourg. (17 S. Broadway, St. Louis, Mo.) pp. 128. Price, 60¢.

We are being well supplied with Hebrew guides. With the recent French edition of Fr. Slaughter's Grammatica Hebraica, Fr. Senepin's Grammaire Hebraique, the Rudimenta of Dr. Vosen, and its English translation by Dr. Gabriels, together with the little manual before us, no beginner need be at a loss for excellent help in acquiring a fair knowledge of the sacred language, nor, let us add, the priest for suggestive aid in reviewing studies the rudiments of which alone were laid in his seminary course; for very appositely does the Abbé Chabot remark, that "les ecclésiastiques qui se sentent une aptitude. . . . pour l'étude de la langue sacrée doivent s'y appliquer avec zèle pour l'honneur de la sainte Eglise, qui désire toujours compter dans son sein des hommes capables d'expliquer les textes originaux."

Clearness, brevity, solidity characterize this manual. Its clearness is aptly illustrated in the introduction on the history, writing, and use of the Hebrew language, in the statement of its rules, and especially in the admirable synoptical tables on the vocal changes and the irregular verbs —those most difficult points of the whole language; its brevity, by its compass; its solidity, by the fact that, wherever desirable, the learner is at once taught the grammatical rule together with its *reason*. If to these essentials of a book of its kind we add the neatness and accuracy of its typography, with its clear cut sections and paragraphs, so helpful to the eye in memory work, it would be hard to find a more acceptable introduction to the study of Hebrew.

THE HOLY MASS. By St. Alphonsus de Liguori. Vol. xiii. of the Centenary Edition of Ascetical Works. Edited by Rev. Eugene Grimm, C. SS. R.—Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1889. Price $1.25.

THE RELIGIOUS STATE. Together with a short treatise on the Vocation to the Priesthood. Transl. from the Italian of St. Alphonsus de Liguori. Edited by Rev. Eugene Grimm, C.SS.R.—Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1889. Price 50¢.

At the close of last year, the Jubilee year of his sacred priesthood, Leo XIII. addressed the world as only a priest and pontiff could do. The Encyclical "De Vita Christiana" was simply a pastor's warning cry, from the heart to his flock. There is in it very much of the spirit of St. Alphonsus, and both the books which we have placed at the head of this Review carry out and sustain one principal thought of that Encyclical, as if, indeed, the sentiment had been nourished there at that very source.

Hence we doubly welcome these labors of Father Grimm, who trans-